



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

elements of success; (3) that some cities are already accomplishing excellent results by measures that can be adopted by all; (4) that relatively few children are so defective as to prevent success in school or life."

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

BIRD T. BALDWIN

The Syntax of High-School Latin: Statistics and Selected Examples Arranged under Grammatical Headings and in Order of Occurrence by Fifty Collaborators. Edited by LEE BYRNE. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1909. Pp. ix+54. \$0.83 postpaid.

In this book Mr. Byrne, with the help of a large number of collaborators, has endeavored to count and tabulate for each book or oration every construction occurring in the average high-school Latin, covering the same field as Mr. Lodge in his *Vocabulary of High-School Latin*, except that (wisely, in my judgment), he includes only four books of Caesar, not five. Statistics are given, notes on categories, a proposed distribution in the course of study, selected examples for each construction, and the same examples in the order of their occurrence—and all this in the brief compass of fifty-four pages. In the exhibition of the examples, Mr. Byrne, following the general style of Mr. Lodge's treatment, has put into bold-faced type the constructions occurring as many as five times in Caesar, into ordinary type those additional constructions which occur five times in Cicero, and into small capitals the new constructions occurring five times in Virgil. The purpose of the whole is to suggest to teachers a reasonable reduction, through the omission of rare constructions, in the total number dwelt upon in high-school work, and an order in which emphasis shall be laid upon those which are taken up. The editor rightly thinks that completeness in the high school may go too far, and defeat its own ends. The spirit of the whole is summed up in the Introduction, in a sentence taken from President Butler: "Details relatively of little value, save in so far as these are absolutely necessary to enable the student to read intelligently, are out of place in secondary education."

The plan is altogether admirable.¹ The book should be in the hands of all teachers, and especially of college instructors who make examination papers in translation, composition, or grammar.

But I do not regard the work as final. Too many persons have been engaged upon it to allow a strictly uniform system to be possible. Moreover, it is too condensed. It does not seem to me wise, for example, to include the

¹I appreciate it all the more, because some of the younger scholars connected with my work were engaged upon a similar plan, in which I was taking part. So, more notably, Mr. W. L. Carr, formerly of the Shortridge High School, Indianapolis, now of the University High School, The University of Chicago, whose name appears frequently under the mention of the individual subjects in Mr. Bryne's preface, and Miss Frances E. Sabin, of the High School at Oak Park, Ill., who, when a graduate student at the University of Chicago, eight years ago prepared a complete classification of all the subjunctives in the seven books of the *Galic War*, on the basis of the Hale-Buck syntax, giving all the examples in full.

subjective genitive with the possessive, or the appositional with the genitive of material, as has been done. In the same way, the ablative with *opus est*, the ablative with *fretus*, and the ablative with *nitor*, are hidden away, without explicit mention, under some more general heads. One cannot even know what the respective heads are, since grammarians differ about the nature of the constructions (thus the ablative with *nitor* is put by Harkness, Gildersleeve and Lodge, and Bennett, under means, while Allen and Greenough and I find it to be locative). It would have been easy to give the actual number of occurrences (thus *opus est* 1 Caesar, 0 Cicero, *fretus*, 1 Caesar, 3 Cicero [2 in one place], *nitor* 2 Caesar [in one place], 0 Cicero); and these low figures, if given, might have helped to keep examiners from calling for these constructions, as they have frequently done, in the elementary composition papers. Moreover, I should not put the ablative of accordance with specification, with which, in my opinion, it has nothing whatever in common. The mere fact that, while the Allen-Greenough and Gildersleeve-Lodge grammars class accordance under this head, Bennett classes it under manner, Harkness under cause, and I under the separative ablative² is a sufficient reason for giving the figures for it separately; and, in any case, it would have been well to inform readers just how frequently this type of construction is found.

Quamquam is entered as occurring once in Caesar. It should have been stated that the word does not appear in the manuscripts, and that most of the German editors of Caesar emend iv. 3 in some other way.

Further, there are certain errors. Thus conditions contrary to fact are put down as not occurring in Caesar; but they do occur (in indirect discourse, but none the less genuinely and with no less importance) three times, namely *si fuisset*, i. 14; *si vellet*, i. 14, and *si esset*, i. 34. Thus, again, the genitive with *miseret*, etc., is listed as occurring eleven times in *Aen.* i-vi. But the references in my article on "Composition," p. 232 of this issue of the *School Review*, show thirteen occurrences.

The book suffers from the unscientific and unsettled character of our terminology and views. Thus the subjunctive in *domi nihil erat quo famem tolerarent*, *B.G.* i. 28, is classed on p. 39 under "characteristic." It is, indeed, so explained by a number of the editors. But the Allen and Greenough, Bennett, and Westcott editions class the example under purpose, while the Johnston and Sanford edition, in accord with my syntax, says "best taken as potential" (i.e., as meaning "there was nothing with which they could relieve their hunger"—a construction with exact parallels in Greek, old Persian, Sanskrit, and Avestan). Such differences lower the value of the statistics, in default of a statement of the author's position, with a list of the places involved. Again, the author follows the accepted, but monstrous, scheme by which *all* subjunctive questions, no matter how widely the corresponding non-interrogative ideas would vary, are classed as "deliberative"—as if all kinds of subjunctive ideas but one changed their nature the moment they are put interrogatively. Thus *quis cladem illius noctis explicet*, *Aen.* ii. 362, which is only a rhetorical way of saying "no one could set forth in words the slaughter of that night," is classed on p. 37

² I find the conception to be that of the habit, institution, etc., from which the individual act proceeds (compare *consuetudine* and *ex consuetudine* in Caesar, *more*, *ex more*, and *de more* in Virgil).

as expressing deliberation! In point of fact, only two out of the ten selected examples of the deliberative really belong under this head.

I should be sorry, however, to close my review by taking exceptions, and wish rather to insist that the book stands for a sound tendency, and that nothing else so detailed or so trusty yet exists.

W. G. HALE

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

The Distribution and Function of Mental Imagery. By GEORGE HERBERT BETTS. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1909. Pp. 99.

This book, presumably a Doctor's thesis, begins by investigating with the questionnaire method the capacity to obtain images in the principal departments of sense. The questionnaire method used is similar to Galton's but more searching and extended. The subjects were students of Cornell College, Iowa, extension classes of Teachers College, New York, and eighteen trained psychologists. Vision was found to be no better than the other senses. Smell and taste, usually thought to be much poorer than the others, were found to have as vivid imagery as vision. In general the various kinds were found to be much more evenly distributed than has been commonly thought.

The second and main part of the book has to do with the occurrence and use of imagery when the purpose is to think on some topic. The author disregards all enunciatory images because of the difficulty of discriminating between them and actual sensations. This is unfortunate, because the book turns out to be an argument in favor of imageless thought and the purely incidental character of much of our imagery. An enunciatory account is necessary to the proof. In thinking the opposites of ten words one-half of the 500 responses were accompanied by no images (except possibly enunciatory), and one-third were accompanied by images which came too late to have been instrumental in suggesting the correct word. When the task was to image for ten seconds what would be seen in the bed of the Atlantic Ocean were the water to disappear, 27 per cent. of the responses were not accompanied by images and in about 25 per cent. the images came too late to have been a cause. There were two other tests of this character, one on auditory imagery and one on gustatory, with similar results. Students were asked whether in reading their favorite pieces of literature they had images (and if so, of what kinds and how many), or whether they only felt or knew or understood the meaning of the piece. The results showed in general, according to the author, that a very large part of our thinking is either devoid of imagery or accompanied by imagery which is only incidental. In the literature test a great deal of imagery was shown to accompany the reading of the literature, but the images played only a small part in the appreciation, the mind loving to dwell on the meaning, feeling, etc.

The results, so far as they concern imageless thought and the incidental character of images, are not convincing to the reviewer. Only trained psychologists (for example graduate students in psychology) should have been used as subjects, and at least an attempt should have been made to take account of *all* the imagery which occurred. If it is easy, as the author says, to detect